

**REMARKS/ARGUMENT****Regarding the Claims in General:**

Claims 2-8, 10-22, 27, 29-55 and 60-61 remain pending. Claims 4, 16, and 60 have been amended to further clarify the original intent thereof in compliance with a suggestion by the Examiner, as discussed below.

**Regarding the Telephone Interview Held November 9, 2004:**

Applicant's representative gratefully acknowledges the courtesy and assistance afforded to him by Examiner Opsasnick during the interview. Summarizing the matters discussed, the Examiner initially pointed out that the Cooper patent was no longer being relied on as a reference.

Applicant's representative pointed out that a distinguishing feature of the invention relative to Adlersberg is that the signal processing according to the invention takes place in the time domain, whereas in the reference, the significant processing is all in the frequency domain.

The Examiner responded that in his view, pending independent claims 4, 16, and 60 did not clearly require the claimed method to be performed in the time domain, but if they were amended to do so, they would patentably distinguish over Adlersberg.

Applicant's representative responded by stating that he considered it clear from the claims that the claims were inherently limited to the time domain. The Examiner then suggested that a supplemental response be submitted pointing out in what respect the claims were so inherently limited, or alternatively, to amend the independent claims to explicitly recite the time domain. Applicant's representative agreed to take the Examiner's suggestion under advisement.

**Regarding the Prior Art Rejections:**


As advised by the Examiner during the Interview, claims 2-17, 30-53, and 60 now stand rejected as unpatentable solely over Adlersberg for the reason stated above. Applicant continues to believe that the claims as previously presented are inherently limited to the time domain, but to advance the prosecution, and to eliminate any possible argument to the contrary, claims 4, 16, and 60 have been amended to explicitly limit them to the time domain. It is understood that these amendments overcome the outstanding rejection.


Because the claims now make explicit what applicant continues to believe was implicit, it is not believed or intended that the scope of the amended claims has been changed.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by Facsimile to (703) 872-9306 addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence A Hoffman  
Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative  
  
Signature  
November 23, 2004  
Date of Signature

  
Lawrence A Hoffman  
Registration No.: 22,436  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

LAH:ayh